

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 89 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 90 through 142 have been added.

Claim 90 defines in combination a shaft having a threaded portion with right-hand threads and a threaded portion with left-hand threads, a hub to mount a web supply roll, the hub threadably receiving one of the threaded portions, a carrier threadably receiving the other threaded portion, at least one opening in the carrier, at least one clamp member movably mounted on the carrier between retracted and extended positions, wherein a supply roll is capable of being loaded onto the hub when the clamp member is in its retracted position and capable of being clamped at a side of the supply roll when the clamp member is in its extended position, and at least one rod received by the hub and extending into the opening in the carrier, the opening in the carrier being large enough to enable the carrier to rotate together with the shaft relative to the rod, the rod cooperating with the clamp member to move the clamp member from its retracted position to its extended position and to move the hub and the carrier with its clamp member toward each other to clamp the supply roll in a center-justified position upon rotation of the shaft in one direction and to move the hub and the clamp member away from each other and to move the clamp member from its extended position to its retracted position and upon rotation of the shaft in the opposite direction.

The patent to Vogel (U.S.6,338,452) and the patent to Sakumoto (US4,813,626) were relied upon in the rejection of the original elected claims.

The Vogel patent does not meet the letter or spirit of claim 90. The Vogel patent does not disclose a carrier for a clamp member rotatable relative to a rod mounted on a roll-carrying hub. In particular, in Vogel there is a core support

220 locked to a nut 240 and there is a core support 210 locked to a nut 230. When shaft or spindle 250 is rotated by a motor-driven pulley wheel 400, the core supports 210 and 220 move toward or away from each other depending on the direction of rotation of the spindle 250. Rods or pins 260, received by a locking device 350 and the core support 220 extend into the core support 210, cause the core supports 210 and 220 to move axially without rotation relative to the pins 260. The pins 260 move the push members 310 from their retracted position (FIG. 2) to their extended position (FIG. 3) when the motor turns the spindle and the core support 210 moves to the right of the position shown in FIG. 2. Please note that the reference character 310 is misapplied in FIG. 2. The pins 260, cooperating with the push members 310 during movement of the core support 210 to the right from FIG. 2 position, cause the movement of the push members 310 from the retracted position (FIG. 2) to the extended position (FIG. 3). Further movement of the core support 210 with the push members 310 is stopped when the push members abut the roll or the left end of winding core 100. It should be noted that in order for the springs 314 to move the push members 310 to their retracted position the core support 210 and the push members 310 must be returned to the position shown in FIG. 2. In Vogel, core support 210 and the core support 220 constitute a hub.

In claim 90, the claimed carrier has an opening large enough to enable the carrier to rotate together with the shaft. Rotation of the shaft in one direction causes the clamp member to move to the extended position and causes the carrier and the clamp member to move toward each other. Rotation of the shaft in the opposite direction causes the hub and the carrier to move away from each other and causes the clamp member to move from the extended position to the

retracted position. The Vogel patent simply does not teach the claimed invention.

Claim 91 further defines the opening in the carrier as being a slot (190 in the preferred embodiment). There is no such disclosure in Vogel.

Claim 92 further defines that the clamp member has an elongate slot through which the rod extends. There is no such disclosure in Vogel.

Claims 93 and 94 claim further structure in combination.

Claim 95 states that the clamped supply roll is center-justified relative to a print head. Vogel has no such disclosure.

Claims 96 through 99 define further features not taught by Vogel.

With respect to claims 100, 101 and 104 the Vogel patent discloses no such knob.

Claims 102 and 103 define the invention with further specificity.

Claim 105 further defines the invention, for which there is no teaching in Vogel.

Claim 106 is similar to claim 90, but claim 106 does not specify the feature of moving the clamp member to the retracted position.

Dependent claims 107 through 120 have generally the same wording as claims 91 through 105. Claim 121 is similar to claim 90, but claim 121 does not claim the feature of moving the clamp member from the retracted position to the extended position and moving the hub and the carrier with its clamp member toward each other.

Dependent claims 122 through 136 have generally the same wording as claims 91 through 105.

Claim 137 is patterned generally after claim 90, but defines plural openings, plural clamp members, and plural rods.

Claim 138 is patterned generally after claim 137, but does not specify the feature of moving the clamp members from their extended positions to their retracted position or moving the hub and the carrier relatively away from each other.

Claim 139 is patterned generally after claim 137, but does not specify the feature of moving the clamp members from their retracted position to their extended positions or moving the hub and the carrier toward each other.


Claims 140 through 142, inter alia, define at least one control member on the hub and extending through the slot in the clamping member, and that the carrier is rotatable relative to the control member. Clearly, Vogel fails to meet these claims.

The patent to Sakumoto discloses a drag control device in a spinning type fishing reel that includes a knob, but there is no teaching or motivation in Vogel to include such a knob.

The application is believed to be in complete condition for allowance. If the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is kindly requested to telephone the undersigned for an interview by telephone or in person.

Respectfully submitted,

Dayton, Ohio
March 20, 2006
(937)865-2012



Joseph J. Grass
Reg. No. 19,768